

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **March 23, 2005**, the Examiner reviewed Claims 1-2, and 4-18. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-2 and 4-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-15, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 6-10 include allowable subject matter if the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections are overcome.

Objections to the claims

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to obviate the objections cited by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-2 and 4-18 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to reflect what was examined by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-15, and 16-18 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to clarify that a special-purpose arithmetic unit is used to perform the interval computations.

These amendments limit the system to using a particular structure other than a general computer. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 8-10 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2 and 4-5, which depend upon claim 1, claims 7-10, which depend upon claim 6, claims 12-15, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 17-18, which depend upon claim 16, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: May 6, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665